

**Remarks**

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for participating in the interview with the Applicants' representative on January 8, 2009. The features of independent Claims 15 and 26, as well as the cited references, were discussed.

The Applicants have amended Claims 15 and 26. The Applicants have canceled Claims 20 and 30. No new claims have been added. Thus, Claims 15-19 and 21-29 are pending.

Claims 15-30 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Kalva. The Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15-19 and 21-29 are patentable over Kalva for the reasons set forth below.

Independent Claim 15 recites a method for the management of interactions between a peripheral command device and a multimedia application exploiting the standard MPEG-4 to display a scene with MPEG-4 objects. A digital sequence in the form of a BIFS node is constructed that defines "a nature of action" and "a parameter for action" that is to be applied to objects of the scene. The BIFS node includes a flag whose status either enables or prevents an action to be taken into account.

Thus, the BIFS node according to Claim 15 advantageously specifies a user's interactions with respect to scene objects and serves as a definition of actions to be applied to the scene based on the user's interactions. A field of the BIFS node defines the action and a second field defines a parameter related to the action, while the flag indicates if the action to be applied to the scene can be taken into account.

Kalva is directed to an interactive communication system that is based on the standard MPEG-4. Kalva discusses the use of scene description, object descriptors, and command descriptors for describing scenes, event sources, and event sinks. Kalva notes that BIFS provides

the information for scene structure, while object descriptors describe streams that represent audio visual objects and command descriptors associate commands with event sources within nodes of a scene (see the sections “MPEG-4 Scene Description,” “Object Descriptors,” and “Command Descriptors” of Kalva).

Kalva does not, however, teach all of the features recited in independent Claim 15. Specifically, Kalva does not recite a flag as part of the BIFS node, where the flag indicates if an action should be taken into account (i.e. applied to the scene) and where the BIFS node includes a nature of action field and a parameter for action field, as recited in Claim 15. Kalva notes that “depending on the information contained in the scene description, the user may have the opportunity to interact with the scene. In addition, the scene description may contain information that enables dynamic behavior. In other words, the scene itself may generate events, without user intervention” (column 4, lines 45-50 of Kalva). However, this is not at all equivalent to the features of the flag that is part of the BIFS node, as recited in Claim 15. The BIFS node of Claim 15 defines actions to a scene desired by a user to be taken into account, and the flag, as part of that definition, specifies whether or not the actions may be applied to the scene. The flag accomplishes this by incorporating a status that *enables or prevents actions defined by the BIFS node*. Kalva simply indicates that a user may have a chance to interact with the scene based upon scene description information that describes established aspects of the scene, but this is not related to user actions defined by a BIFS node. Moreover, the flag of Claim 15 that enables or prevents user actions is not at all part of any scene description information but is instead part of specific user actions.

Additionally, Kalva states that dynamic behavior may be enabled based on information in the scene description. However, this dynamic behavior is not at all related to user actions, which

is acknowledged by Kalva in column 4, lines 49-50 ("without user intervention"). Thus, as the dynamic behavior is not related to user actions, the information in the scene description also is not at all related to user interactions, which is in sharp contrast to the features of Claim 15 in which the BIFS node along with the flag specifies user actions and whether the user actions may be applied or taken into account.

Claims 16-19 and 21-25 are patentable at least due to their dependency on Claim 15, shown above to be patentable. Independent Claim 26 recites computer equipment that includes the features of the BIFS node recited in Claim 15. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 26 and its dependent Claims 27-29 are patentable for the reasons described above with respect to Claim 15.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury  
Reg. No. 31,750  
Attorney for Applicants

TDC/vp  
(215) 656-3381